DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 584 EA 004 109

AUTHOR Brown, Frank
TITLE Need Satisfaction of Educational Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (57th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Research; Employment Level; *Job Satisfaction; *Need Gratification; *Psychological Needs; Research Reviews (Publications); Self Actualization; Speeches; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

This speech presents the results of a study of five psychological need classes, ordered from the most basic to the least basic -- security, social, esteem, autonomy, and self actualization. A questionnaire on need satisfaction was applied to a sample of public school administrators. Analysis revealed that there is no relation between administrators' need satisfaction and community type, line or staff type positions, type of principalship, age, sex, ethnic identification, or organizational size. However, it did reveal the existence of a statistically significant relationship between administrators' need satisfaction and job level, minority student composition of a school, and between level of education. (Author)

ED 061584

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This paper was prepared for delivery at the 1972 AERA Annual Meeting in Chicago.

NEED SATISFACTION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

by

FRANK BROWN
Director, Urban Institute and
Assistant Professor of Education
The City College, The City
University of New York

EA 004 109

NEED SATISFACTION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction and the Research Problem

Motivational theorists and industrial psycholgists researching and theorizing about job satisfaction among business executives consistently conclude that job satisfaction is highly correlated with job level or status, and not necessarily with the nature of duties performed. However, it is hoped that educational administrators are motivated primarily by an altruistic desire to educate children. Thus, a building principal should be just as satisfied with his position as a superintendent.

This research attempted to obtain evidence on public school administrators' need satisfaction. The basic research question was "Is it true that high level administrators receive greater satisfaction from their jobs than lower level administrators?" Or, are there other characteristics, travering occupational levels which seem to be more determinant of job satisfaction? More specifically, this research was concerned with types of needs administrators seek to satisfy from their jobs and with the degree to which they feel these needs are being fulfilled through their jobs.

---

[1]This work was supported, in part, by a grant from the University of California at Berkeley.

Five psychological need classes considered to be ordered from the most basic to the least basic (Porter 1961,1964) were researched: security, social, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. These need classes are further separated into groups lower-order (security and social) and higher-order (esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization) needs.[2]

It was expected that differences in need satsifaction would result from lower level administrators receiving less satisfaction among high order needs than administrators in high level positions.

How are employee needs satisfied within organizations? Typically, organizational reward systems are structured so that being promoted is equivalent to having more of one's needs satisfied. Ideally, this concept of increased need satisfaction as one moves upward within the hierarchy would be perfect if organizations were strict hierarchies of power. Moreover, promotion to a higher position is is not a guarantee of increased need satisfaction, but merely an opportunity to do so (particularly for high-order needs) which may be restricted by the nature of the job. To reverse the situation, measures of employee need satisfaction may be a useful tool for defining job levels.

---

[2]This research makes use of a modified version of Maslow's hierarchy-of-need structure. It was considered that, in general, administrators would have such basic needs as physiological and safety satisfied which was included in Maslow's original classification scheme. Thus, the modified classification scheme as devised by Porter (1961,1964) makes it possible to examine a wider range of psychological needs.

It was the objective of this research to discover relations between administrators' need satisfaction and other factors thought to influence behavior. Even though empirically derived relations do not explain why people behave in a given manner, they can provide information for many useful purposes. For example, we may find that some individuals who enjoyed certain hobbies during their youth are more successful in a given job than other individuals who pursued other hobbies. While it may never be known why this is so, this information, nevertheless, may be useful in the selection of employees for a particular job in the future. Additionally, the accumulation of empirical information about a particular phase of human behavior can lead to hypotheses and subsequent formalized theories about it.

From a practical point of view, information on administrators' need satisfaction can be indispensable to individual administrators, job counselors, and school districts in making wise decisions about such matters as hiring and promoting (Porter 1961,1964).

Understanding employee needs should benefit organizations in other ways. First, it should aid in developing an adequate reward system. Secondly, it should increase the feasibility of long range planning in the area of personnel policy. Thirdly, it should reduce conflict and conserve valuable organizational energy.

Finally, this study attempted to contribute to administrative theory by:

(a) Providing additional information regarding whether or not findings on need satisfaction generalize across institutional boundaries. More specifically, whether or not findings on need satisfaction among business executives generalize to educators.

(b) These findings should enable us to understand better the conceptual relationship between man and his employment. Before proceeding a discussion of human motivation is necessary.

Theoretical Framework

In analyzing human motivation two schools of thought have prevailed: deficiency motivation and growth motivation.[3] It has been a dominant belief among psychologists for decades that human motivation originates in needs. Behavior is thought to be based primarily upon need-reduction, a process referred to as deficiency motivation. Recent experiments, however, appear to invalidate the need-reduction concept in both specific and general forms. For some time, those who opposed need-reduction as a basic construct could not produce an acceptable alternative (to psychologists).

---

[3]The term "motivation" has various connotations. One way of defining motivation, according to Maslow (1943, p. 68), is to speak of a particular state of the individual-one of balance or imbalance. The person seeks a state of balance or is motivated to correct an imbalanced state; that is, he seeks relief of fulfilling unsatisfied needs.

A different construct of motivation proposed by Maslow (1943) has recently gained wide acceptance by motivational theorists. Maslow referred to his construct as "growth motivation" as opposed to deficiency motivation.[4] According to his construct, individuals are motivated by a desire to grow, a process which continues long after basic needs have been reduced. Self actualization theorists such as Goldstein (1939), Rogers (1951) and especially Maslow (1955, 1968) maintain that deficiency and self-actualization are not contradictory but complementary to each other. That is, deficiency needs are viewed as a necessary prerequisite for self-actualization. Maslow (1968, p. 26) concludes that need:

> ...gratification breeds increased rather than decreased motivation heightened rather than lessened excitement. The appetites become intensified and heightened. They grow upon themselves and instead of wanting less and less, such a person wants more and more...Growth is, <u>in itself</u>, a rewarding and exciting process.

<u>Deficiency Motivation</u>. Deficiency theorists maintain that behavior results from a need which represents a deficit. According to this theory a hunger drive and the consequent behavior are initiated by a need. Behavior occurs, relative to a given motive in a cycle from disequilibrium to a state of balance. However, the basic postulate of the deficiency theory is that any drive, and the subsequent behavior is the result of an unfulfilled need.

---

[4]Growth motivation is also referred to as self-actualization.

Psychologists such as Goldstein (1939) and Maslow (1954, 1968) are critical of this viewpoint. Their principal objection to this view is that it does not explain all motivated behavior. They point out that if only deficits motivate behavior, individuals whose basic needs are constantly satisfied would never change or develop. Such individuals would have no vigor and therefore become entirely inert. This static condition would not seem to apply to many in our society whose basic needs have been met, yet many of these individuals continue to seek money, status, and prestige. Nevertheless, many of those who support the deficiency construct maintain that their critics are teleogists, and are therefore outside the realm of science.

Growth Motivation. Self-actualization theorists (Goldstein, 1939; Rogers, 1951; Maslow, 1943) maintain that need-reduction as a basic construct for exploring human behavior is too limited. In addition to need reduction, people are further motivated because they wish to grow. Maslow, (1943, 1954), in particular, delineated characteristics of growth motivation, as opposed to deficiency motivation which he identifies with need-reduction theory. According to Maslow (1968) self-actualization or growth motivated people are motivated to achieve character growth, character expression, maturation and development. Growth to Maslow (1943, 1954, 1968) means that individuals will continue to seek greater social recognition, self-respect, and other higher-order needs long after basic needs have been gratified.

The distinctive characteristic of growth motivation is that an individual is autonomous; his development is not based upon need reduction.[5] Furthermore, deficiency motivated individuals are more dependent upon the environment for their need satisfaction, while, self-actualization individuals are, by definition, satisfied in their basic needs, and less dependent upon the environment. Maslow (1943, p. 214) contends that:

> Deficiency-motivated people must have other people available since most of their main need gratifications (love, safety, respect, prestige, belongingness) can come only from other human beings. But growth-motivated people may actually be hampered by others. The determinants of satisfaction and of the good life are for them now inner-individual and not social. They have become strong enough to be independent of the good opinion of other people, or even of their affection. The honors, status, the rewards, the prestige, and the love they can bestow must have become less important than self-development and inner growth.

It has been suggested by Maslow (1943, 1954, 1968) that a sound motivational theory must assume that people are continuously in a motivational state, but the nature of the motivation is fluctuating and complex; moreover, individuals rarely reach a state of complete satisfaction, except for a short time. As one desire (need) becomes satisfied, another replaces it. This never-ending sequence

---

[5]Needs are internal wants of individuals (Smith, 1955) while incentives are external factors which individuals perceive as possible satisfiers of his needs.

gives rise to Maslow's theory of motivation in which a hierarchy of needs is postulated. This theory is based on the concept that human needs are ordered, generally, in terms of their relative potency as motivators.

Maslow (1965) later expanded his list of assumptions that underlie his and supporting theories on growth motivation. He called this theory Eupsychian which he defined as the culture that would be generated by self-actualization people. Self-actualization people would be expected: (1) to effectuate one's own ideas, select one's own friends, grow, and make mistakes, (2) to enjoy good teamwork, friendship, good group harmony, and group love, (3) to assume that growth occurs through delight and boredom, and (4) ultimately at the highest level of growth, show a tendency to identify with more of the world, moving toward ultimate mysticism, and cosmic consciousness.

Eupsychian theory (Maslow, 1965, p. 261) describes people as "growing and growing" in health of personality and especially in their aspirations. In commenting on possible implications of this concept Maslow contends that this trend is greater among women and underprivileged groups. This means that once people grow or move to a higher level of living, gain a feeling of dignity and self-respect for the first time, they will never again be content with less, even though they made no protest about the situation before experiencing their growth. Furthermore, for most Americans, the level of personality development has made eupsychian management a competitive factor (Maslow 1965).

The two viewpoints presented, deficiency and growth motivation, have been discussed only in skeletal form. Specific variations of the general theories have not been discussed even though in each case several variations do exist. Moreover, no attempt has been made to evaluate the two theories in terms of experimental evidence since such an evaluation is beyond the scope of this study. Finally, it should be noted that certain theories of motivation would not fall into the categories discussed.

Maslow's Need Structure. In 1943 Maslow proposed a useful construct for assessing human needs and their effects upon behavior. He suggested that needs may be classified into different classes. The unique feature of Maslow's need construct is his belief that these need classes form a hierarchy. In essence, the theory states that there are basic or primary needs, which an individual attempts to satisfy first. Afterward, he focuses upon the satisfaction of less basic needs.

The hierarchy of needs concept is critical, since its basic primise assumes that:

1. The behavior of an individual is dominated and determined by the most basic need classes which are unfulfilled.

2. The individual will systematically seek satisfaction of his needs, starting with the most basic and moving up the hierarchy.

3. More basic needs are "prepotent" in that they will take precedence over all those higher in the hierarchy.

An important concept in the hierarchy of needs theory is that a satisfied need ceases to motivate. If this is true, then it becomes clear that many incentives offered by organizations to motivate behavior must be re-examined in light of findings based upon employee attitudes toward their job related needs.

By definition the hierarchy is separated into categories (Maslow 1954) of higher and lower needs. Lower need classes, security and social, are considered basic. While, higher order needs, esteem, autonomy and self actualization, are considered less basic. The higher needs (also called "growth needs") can never be completely or permanently satisfied. However, they serve to expand continually the range and intensity of experience. Lower order needs, on the other hand, are finite and can be satisfied completely. The various need levels are interdependent and overlapping, (Maslow 1943, 1954) each higher level need emerging before the lower level need has been completely satisfied. Furthermore, individuals may jumble the order of importance around.

EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON NEED SATISFACTION

Articles on need satisfaction using other methodologies and types of motivational theory abound in journals and no review will be attempted here. Thus, only empirical studies which make use of a hierarchy of need construct in assessing administrators job satisfaction will be reviewed.

Situational Variables

Herzberg et al (1957), summarized the literature through 1954 relevant to job-related attitudes and concluded that high level administrators recevied greater satisfaction from their job than lower level administrators. Porter (1966) reveiwed the literature in 1966 and drew a similar conclusion.

Browne and Neitzel (1952) researched three levels of administration and reported that satisfaction scores were positively related to high job level. In 1961, two studies researching different levels of administration among business executives were published by Porter (1961) and Rosen (1961). Rosen studied three levels of administration and reported that top and middle level administrators did not differ significantly in job satisfaction, but both top and middle level managers received greater job satisfaction than lower level managers. Porter researched two levels of administration and reported that high level administrators received greater satisfaction from their job than lower level administrators. Porter (1962) researched job satisfaction among business executives across all levels of administration and reported findings that were in general agreement with those from previous studies by Porter (1961) and Rosen (1961).

Several studies by Opinion Research Corportation (1962) reported findings similar to Porter (1961) and Rosen (1961).

Recent studies by Graham (1969), Edel (1966), El Salmi and Cummings (1968), Ivancevich (1969), Johnson and Marcum (1968), Miller (1966), Paine et al (1966), Porter and Mitchell (1967), and Rhinehart et al (1969) reported that, generally, high level administrators receive greater satisfaction from their jobs than lower level administrators. These studies sampled administrators from such diverse organizations as business and industry, the military, labor unions, and governmental agencies, both foreign and domestic.

Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1964) surveyed business executives in 14 countries and reported that top level administrators receive greater satisfaction from their positions than lower level administrators.

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) surveyed teachers and administrators and reported that professional roles were significantly related to job satisfaction. However, the study has suffered (Haller 1967) criticism concerning its sample size and methodology.

Evidence (Porter 1963, 1966) available on satisfaction provided by line and staff type positions is consistent in showing line administrators to be more satisfied with their jobs than those in staff positions.

Organization Variables

The literature reveals few studies researching the relationship between job satisfaction and total organizational size. Two studies

by Porter (1963, 1964) found no overall advantage for either large or small organizations in relation to job satisfaction among business exectives.

Meltzer and Salter (1962) researched the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational shape (tall or flat) among physiologists in non-academic organizations and reported no significant relation between tallness or flatness and job satisfaction.[6] Porter and Lawler (1964) researched this relationship, job satisfaction and shape, and reported similar results.

Baker and France (1954) researched managers in centralized and decentralized industrial relations departments and reported no relationship between job satisfaction and organizational shape. Litzinger (1963) researched this relationship among bank managers and reported similar findings. In each instance classification of centralized or decentralized organizations was based upon the level at which decisions were made, relative to administrators.

Personal Variables

Porter (1961, researching among business executives reported that no significant relationship exists between an administrators satisfaction and his age. This relationship was expected to hold for school administrators because seniority was considered a

---

[6]Managers were classified as working in either a tall or flat organizational structure based upon number of levels relative to total size.

strong factor for getting promoted to administrative positions within education. Thus, one would expect to find a larger number of older administrators in high level positions, which if true, seems to indicate a significant relationship between job satisfaction and age.

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) surveyed school teachers and administrators and reported the existence of a significant relationship between job satisfaction and sex.

Summary. A survey of the literature reveals that among administrators, the strongest factor affecting his job satisfaction is job level.

DESIGN AND METHOD

Before the method of research is discussed, it is necessary to define some of the terms that were used.

Definition of Terms

School administrator: Employee of a public school system whose functions are entirely administrative.

Job level: Employee's position within the organization is referred to as job level. Job levels are categorized by titles in the following manner:

(1) Level 1 -- Superintendents
(2) Level 2 -- Assistant-Superintendents
(3) Level 3 -- Directors, Coordinators, and Supervisors[7]
(4) Level 4 -- Principals

[7]Hereafter, Level 3 will be referred to as director, only.

Organizational size: The size of a school district is represented by its student population. Three categories of school district size were employed and defined as:

(1) Small -- a district with fewer than 8,000 students
(2) Medium -- a district with more than 8,000 students but fewer than 17,000
(3) Large -- districts with a student population greater than 17,000

Age: Two categories of age (in years) were employed and defined as:

(1) Young -- operating administrators less than 45 years of age
(2) Old -- operating administrators older than 45 years of age

Ethnic Background: The ethnicity component was represented by respondents listing their "ethnic background" as minority or non-minority.

Minority Student Concentration: Minority student composition was represented by the percentage of minority students within an individual school or district. Two categories of student ethnic composition were employed:

(1) individual schools or districts with fewer than 20% minorities, and
(2) those with more than 20% minorities.

Criterion Variable: This research presented subjects with a number of need items designed to elicit certain psychological need

characteristics. Assessment of need satisfaction was made by examining five psychological need classes: (1) security, (2) social, (3) esteem, (4) autonomy, and (5) self-actualization (see Table 1).[8] To collect information on each of the need areas respondents were asked:

> (1) To what extent are these needs being met in my present position?
> (2) To what estent should these needs be provided for in my present position?

Respondents were asked to provide their views on thirteen need items by making use of a rating scale from 1 to 7. Questions about specific need items <u>defined</u> need satisfaction as <u>the difference between how much each need an administrator thinks is being satisfied and how much he thinks he should be getting from his position</u>. This research makes use of the University of California Management Position Questionnaire (Porter 1961, 1964).

This form of measuring attitudes has some drawbacks, among them being that it does not go into extreme depth. However, its <u>virtue</u> (Blum and Naylor, 1968) and the consideration that seems overriding in this case is that one is assured that each respondent

[8]Before proceeding, it is useful to describe the five need classes. <u>Security needs</u> refers to one's feeling of safety and assurance in his position. <u>Social needs</u> refers to the desire to develop close personal relations and the opportunity to help people. <u>Esteem needs</u> refers generally to respect one receives from his position, both self-esteem and esteem received from others. <u>Autonomy need</u> refers to the authority connected with a position and opportunity for independence in this position. <u>Self-actualization needs</u> refers to feelings of self fulfillment, accomplishments, personal growth and worth.

TABLE 1

Need Categories and Specific Need Items Within Categories as Listed in the Questionnaire

Need Categories	Specific Need Items
Security	The feeling of security in my position
Social	The opportunity, in my position, to give help to other people
	The opportunity to develop close friendships in my position
Esteem	The feeling of self-esteem obtained from my position
	The prestige of my position inside the district (that is, the regard received from others in the district)
	The prestige of my position outside the district (that is, the regard received from others not in the district)
Autonomy	The authority connected with my position
	The opportunity for independent thought and action in my position
	The opportunity, in my position, for participation in the determination of goals
	The opportunity, in my position, for participation in the determination of methods and procedures
Self-Actualization	The opportunity for personal growth and development in my position
	The feeling of self-fulfillment obtained from my position (that is, the feeling of being able to use one's own unique capabilities)
	The feeling of worthwhileness in my position

answered exactly the same questions, and the results are strictly comparable from one group to another. This seems to be an important exchange, depth for exactitude, moreover, this instrument has been standardized on a large general population in many different organizational settings and tested for statistical reliability and validity.

Size, selection and method of sampling. A total of 1,000 questionnaires were mailed, 250 to each of four categories of administrators. Each category was drawn from the entire State of California, selected by stratified random sample procedures.

Stratification was applied by job level to insure a sufficient response from each level, expecially superintendents and assistant-superintendents. There were cetain weaknesses in the sampling procedure. In the first place, the question of generalizaing to "all" school administrators occurs because the sample was taken from public school administrators only. Administrators of schools for the blind, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, and continuation (potential dropouts) students were not included in the sample. Whereas, extreme generalizability was desirable, it was felt that the inclusion of such deviant cases (giving greater generalizability) representing a minute portion of school administrators might lesses the reliability of the entire study. Thus, it seemed that greater reliability for generalizability was a fair trade.

Statistical Procedures. The research design employed in this research was chosen for its appropriateness for testing the general experimental hypothesis that K population means are equal.

To test this hypothesis, a randomized block (by job level) factorial design which utilized analysis of variance techniques was employed. An F ratio, analysis of variance, was used to test for over-all relations between variables. Where significant relations exist, Scheffe' contrasts were employed to ascertain at which level or levels of independent variable accounted for the variance in the criterion variable.

FINDINGS

The Basic Research Question. As to the basic research question of predicting need satisfaction by job level, the answer is very simple. An F ratio test of significance indicated a strong relation between need satisfaction and job level. (See Tables 2 and 3.) The computed probability of being in error was .0001. (A probability of .05 was the accepted level of significance test.) Thus, the low probability of being in error gives added support to the claim that a significant relationship exists between need satisfaction and job level.

A comparison of the means (Table 3), revealed that a successive stair-step type hierarchy did not exist, instead there are two groups. Principals and directors are on the bottom while assistant-

TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance: Need Satisfaction of Administrators at Different Job Levels

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = N_4 = 180$, Total N = 720

Source	df	MS	F	P<
Job Level	3	694.4852	8.4782	.0001*
Trend				
(1) Linear	(1)	1426.3211	17.4123	.0001*
(2) Quadratic	(1)	33.8000	.4126	.5209
(3) Cubic	(1)	623.3344	7.6096	.0060*
Error	716	81.9144		

TABLE 3

Need Satisfaction: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Administrators at Different Job Levels

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = N_4 = 180$, Total N = 720

Mean Scores[1] on:	Supt. Mean	Supt. S. D.	Asst. Supt. Mean	Asst. Supt. S. D.	Directors Mean	Directors S. D.	Principals Mean	Principals S. D.
Security Needs (6)	4.92	1.32	4.89	1.32	4.81	1.53	4.80	1.45
Social Needs (12)	10.12	1.61	10.55	1.39	10.34	1.86	10.27	1.60
Esteem Needs (18)	16.09	1.94	16.05	2.09	15.11	2.27	15.26	2.42
Autonomy Needs (24)	21.64	2.47	21.17	3.40	19.17	4.52	19.92	3.34
Self-actualization Needs (18)	15.04	2.51	15.12	3.03	14.60	3.70	14.62	2.81
Need Satisfaction	67.81	7.06	67.78	8.51	64.02	1146	64.86	8.61

[1]It is recalled that increased job satisfaction was represented by lower scores, however, for easy readability high scores are designated as the better ones.

superintendents and superintendents are on top. That is, principals and directors received similar satisfaction from their positions while the same is true of assistant-superintendents and superintendents.

Community Setting. Three community settings (urban, suburban, and rural/small towns) were analyzed in order to assess their relation to administrators' need satisfaction. An overall F test of significance proved negative. This was not expected since suburbia, small towns, and rural areas are generally preferred places of employment by educators over urban districts. However, it is possible that school problems such as youth rebellion, poor school support, and political interference transcend community types.

Line-Staff. A survey of responses revealed that line-staff type positions existed mainly among directors and assistant-superintendents. Only administrators occupying these positions were researched. An F test of significance revealed that for educational administrators position type, line-staff is not related to their need satisfaction.

Job-Site. An item of tremendous interest to educators is the question of which principalship offers the greatest reward (to administrators): (1) elementary, (2) junior high, or (3) high school. To date, no such relations have been researched. It was expected, however, that a high school principal would enjoy his

position the most. Nevertheless, an overall F test of significance did not confirm that belief. Principals at any job-site generally receive similar satisfaction from their positions.

Minority Student Population. Abounding in the news media and eudcational journals is the so-called "minority" or ethnic problem. It was felt that administrators faced with this problem, real or imaginary, would consider themselves less well-off than those without the problem. This question seemed complicated by the fact that the problem should in some way depend upon the ethnic identification of the administrator. However, ethnic identification was examined and found not to affect need satisfaction. Nevertheless, principals who administered schools with 20% plus minority enrollment enjoyed their positions less than those with fewer minority students. On the other hand, minority student composition did not affect central office administrators.

A comparison of means (Table 5) for each type principalship indicated that: (1) elementary principals with a sizable minority student enrollment received less satisfaction from their positions than those with fewer minority students, (2) likewise, junior high principals with a sizable minority student enrollment enjoyed their job positions less, and (3) minority student compositions did not make a difference with senior high principals. However, junior high principals with few or no minority students received the greatest satisfaction from their positions, while elementary principals with a sizable minority student enrollment received the least.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance: Need Satisfaction of Principals Serving Two Categories of Minority Student Population

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = 48$, Total N = 144

Source	df	MS	F	P<
Principals (A)	2	102.0069	1.3654	.2588
Minority Students (B)	1	568.0278	7.6030	.0067*
A X B	2	82.3819	1.1027	.3349
Error	138	74.7107		

TABLE 5

Need Satisfaction: Mean Scores of Principals Serving Two Categories of Minority Student Population

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = 48$, Total N = 144

	Less than 20% Minority		Greater than 20% Minority	
Principals	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
Elementary	66.17	7.34	60.92	12.44
Junior High	68.75	5.87	63.04	8.22
Senior High	63.71	9.10	62.75	7.40

TABLE 5

Need Satisfaction: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Principals Serving Two Categories of Minority Student Population.

Mean scores on:	Elementary Mean (S.D.)		Junior High Mean (S.D.)		High School Mean (S.D.)	
	≻ 20%	≺ 20%	≻ 20%	≺ 20%	≻ 20%	≺ 20%
Security (6) Needs	4.67 (1.66)	4.29 (1.83)	4.77 (1.48)	5.00 (.93)	5.17 (.87)	4.21 (1.91)
Social (12) Needs	10.42 (1.64)	10.00 (2.17)	9.71 (1.55)	10.50 (1.56)	10.46 (1.28)	10.08 (1.61)
Esteem (18) Needs	15.79 (1.77)	14.50 (2.92)	15.54 (1.91)	14.42 (2.60)	16.00 (2.32)	15.04 (2.18)
Autonomy (24) Needs	20.08 (3.08)	18.42 (4.52)	19.25 (3.67)	18.67 (3.42)	21.67 (1.95)	19.64 (3.09)
Self-actualization Needs (18)	15.21 (2.67)	13.71 (3.59)	14.33 (2.68)	14.17 (2.50)	15.46 (1.96)	14.08 (2.64)
Need Satisfaction (78)	66.17 (7.34)	60.92 (12.44)	63.71 (9.10)	62.75 (7.40)	68.75 (5.87)	63.04 (8.22)

Age. Research on age and need satisfaction is consistent in showing that no relationship exists. However, with a strong senority system operating within school districts, it was expected that age would show some relation to administrators' need satisfaction. That is, older administrators tend to occupy more high level positions than younger ones. Nevertheless, age was shown not to affect administrators' job satisfaction.

Sex. A study of educators by Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966), had indicated that sex was significant in assessing need satisfaction. Because of a limited number of female administrators operating at high level positions, only elementary principals and directors were included in the sample for analysis. It was found, however, that female principals and directors did not differ significantly from their male counterparts in satisfaction derived from their positions.

Ethnicity. Administrators' ethnic identification was considered of interest for several reasons: (1) because of a growing demand within minority communities for more minority administrators; (2) apparent discrimination in hiring practices for minority applicants; and (3) a prevailing practice among school districts to assign minority administrators to settings dealing mainly with minority students.

It was expected that minority administrators would be found primarily in middle and lower level positions. Thus, minority

principals were compared with non-minority principals and likewise, middle management types (directors) with same. However, this research found no difference between minority and non-minority administrators in satisfaction derived from their positions.

Education. Level of education was considered of interest because (1) academic preparation is considered a major asset in hiring personnel and measuring the quality of services rendered, and (2) school districts generally pay salary increments for additional academic training. It was expected that most administrators would possess at least a master's degree. Thus, it was felt that only those with or without a doctorate would be of interest. Findings indicated that administrators with doctorates differed significantly from those without doctorates. Superintendents and assistant-superintendents with or without doctorates received similar satisfaction from their positions. While, directors and principals without doctorates received less satisfaction from their positions than those with doctorates (Table 7). Directors without doctorates received the least satisfaction from their positions while principals with a doctorate received the most. The superintendent is second to the principal with a doctorate in satisfaction derived from his position.

Organizational Variables

Organizational Size. A survey of the literature indicated that organizational size has no relationship to need satisfaction. This

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance: Need Satisfaction of Administrators at Different Job Levels and Categories of Education

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = N_4 = 50$, Total N = 200

Source	df	MS	F	P<
Job Level (A)	3	422.2067	4.5118	.0044
Education (B)	1	591.6800	6.3228	.0128*
A X B	3	145.3600	1.5533	.2022
Error	192	93.5787		

TABLE 7

Need Satisfaction: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Administrators at Different Job Levels and Categories of Education

$N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = N_4 = 50$, Total N = 200

	Less than Doctorate		Doctorate	
Job Level	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
Superintendent	68.00	5.80	69.00	6.77
Asst. Superintendent	67.56	6.39	67.60	12.10
Directors	58.76	15.68	65.52	12.46
Principals	64.60	8.61	70.56	2.62

TABLE 7

Need Satisfaction: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Administrators at Different Job Levels and Categories of Education.

Mean Scores on:	Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Directors		Principals	
	>doctorate	doctorate	>doctorate	doctorate	>doctorate	doctorate	>doctorate	doctorate
	Mean (S.D.)		Mean (S.D.)		Mean (S.D.)		Mean (S.D.)	
Security (6) Needs	4.88 (1.48)	4.84 (1.52)	4.84 (1.21)	4.64 (1.50)	4.84 (1.55)	5.20 (1.26)	4.60 (1.41)	5.28 (.84)
Social (12) Needs	10.32 (1.84)	10.12 (1.64)	10.36 (1.50)	10.68 (1.28)	10.40 (1.89)	10.64 (1.70)	9.92 (1.55)	11.00 (.91)
Esteem (18) Needs	15.76 (1.77)	16.40 (1.85)	15.68 (2.12)	15.88 (2.73)	14.20 (3.67)	14.84 (3.31)	15.80 (2.02)	16.80 (1.04)
Autonomy (24) Needs	21.96 (1.77)	22.16 (1.82)	21.56 (2.35)	21.00 (4.10)	16.72 (5.77)	19.68 (4.74)	19.68 (3.24)	21.36 (1.68)
Self-actualization Needs (18)	15.08 (2.33)	15.48 (2.33)	15.12 (3.24)	15.40 (3.70)	12.60 (5.18)	15.16 (3.68)	14.60 (2.65)	16.12 (1.62)
Need Satisfaction (78)	68.00 (5.80)	69.00 (6.77)	67.56 (6.39)	67.60 (12.10)	58.76 (15.68)	65.52 (12.46)	64.60 (8.61)	70.56 (2.62)

research also revealed that no relationship exists between organizational size and need satisfaction. However, analysis revealed a significant interaction between job level and size. This seemed plausible since large districts tend to have a larger ratio of administrative positions. Nevertheless, the computer correlation measure was .04 indicating a weak association.[9]

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This research examined the relationship between ten variables and administrators' need satisfaction. Of the ten, three indicated a significant relationship to need satisfaction and seven did not. Those variables found to have a significant relationship to need satisfaction were: (1) job level, (2) education, and (3) minority student composition. While those found not to affect need satisfaction were: (1) community setting, (2) line-staff type position, (3) job-site, (4) age, (5) sex, (6) ethnicity, and (7) organizational size.

It will be recalled that analysis of variance on the dependent variable, need satisfaction, resulted in $F = 8.48$ ($df = 3/716$; $p < .0001$) when related to job level; $F = 7.60$ ($df = 1/138$, $p < .0067$) when related to minority student population; and $F = 6.32$ ($df = 1/192$, $p < .013$) when related to education. Three independent variables

[9]This correlation measure is considered weak, because mean satisfaction scores did not differ significantly according to district size.

job level, minority student population, and education resulted in statistical significance beyond the .05 level. Only one of the interactions, job level and district size, were statistically significant.

Earlier studies (Haire 1963, Porter 1962) revealed that administrators at all levels of administration consistently view high-order needs as the most important. Yet, high-order needs are the least satisfied. Moreover, lower level administrators receive less satisfaction among high-order needs than top level administrators.

This research surveyed four levels of school administrators from building principal to the superintendency and found that top level administrators, assistant-superintendents and superintendents, received similar satisfaction from their positions. They also received greater satisfaction from their positions than lower level administrators,particularly among the high-order need classes. While directors and principals received similar satisfaction from their positions, generally it was less than that received by assistant-superintendents and superintendents.

This study revealed that the strongest factor affecting educational administrators job satisfaction was status or the prestige of their position. This was reflected by the high correlation between job level, high level of education, and the criterion

variable need satisfaction. Also, principals of schools with a sizeable minority pupil population received less satisfaction from their positions. One may speculate that schools with a sizeable minority student population are viewed as low status schools and thus, again it is status that affects need satisfaction. It seems fair to conclude that the reward system within education is geared toward increased status, not necessarily output. In order to help school administrators derive satisfaction from their positions other than by relying solely upon increased status, several first-steps should be taken. First, school districts and universities should join in cooperative programs that will encourage and assist administrators in assessing their needs and those of the school district. Second, any such program should be relevant to the needs of participants and the schools.

Further, it is recommended that increased funds be spent by every level of government to do research on the administrative hierarchy within education. There appears little justification for expenditures on curriculum development studies if administrators, who must implement these findings, are motivated by factors such as job status and the prestige of a doctorate rather than innovative or creative curricula programs. Because the problem appears to be national in scope, an organization similar to the National Science

Foundation be established to train educational administrators.[10] If these recommendations are not adhered to and the status quo remains intact, it seems reasonable to conclude that educational administrators will continue to seek increased status as a means of satisfying their job-related needs.

Finally, Maslow's hierarchy-of-needs construct proved to be a useful instrument for assessing the need satisfaction of educational administrators. Future research in the area should attempt to correlate need satisfaction of employees within organizations with major activities carried on outside formal organizations.

---

[10] The National Science Foundation was established by the Federal Government to solve a national problem of inadequate science and mathematic curriculum in elementary and secondary schools.

REFERENCES

1. Argyris, C. "Individual-Organizational Actualization", Administrative Science Quarterly, Sept. 1959.

2. _____. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

3. Baker H. and France, R.R. "Centralization and Decentralization in Industrial Relations", Princeton: Industrial Relations, 1954.

4. Blum, M. L., and Naylor, J. C. Industrial Psychology - Its Theoretical and Social Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

5. Browne, C. G., and Neitzel, B. J. "Communication, Supervision, and Morale", Journal of Applied Psychology. Vo. 36, 1952.

6. Edel, E. C. "A Study of Managerial Motivation", Personnel Administration. Vo. 29, No. 6, 1966.

7. El Salmi, A. M., and Cummings, L. L. "Managers' Perceptions of Needs and Need Satisfactions as a Function of Interactions Among Organizational Variables", Personnel Psychology. Vo. 21, 1968.

8. Evans, M. G. "Conceptual and Operational Problems in the Management of Various Aspects of Job Satisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 53, No. 2, 1969.

9. Ghiselli, E. E. "Traits Differentiating Management Personnel", Personnel Psychology, Vo. 12, 1959.

10. Goldstein, K. The Organism. New York: American Book Co., 1939.

11. Graham, W. K. "Comparison of Job Attitude Components Across Three Organizational Levels", Personnel Psychology, Vo. 22, 1969.

12. Haire, M. "Cultural Patterns in the Role of the Manager", Industrial Relations. February 1963.

13. _____. Organization Theory in Industrial Practice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

14. Haire, M., Ghiselli, E.E., and Porter, L.W. Managerial Thinking: An International Study. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

15. Haller, E. J., "Some Uncongenial Comments" Educational Administration Quarterly, Vo. 3(3), Autumn, 1967.

16. Harrison, R. L. "Source of Variation in Managers' Job Attutides", Personnel Psychology, Vo. 13, 1963.

17. Hemphill, J. K. "Situational Factors in Leadership", Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph No. 32, Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1949.

18. Herzberg, F. (Ed.) Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychology Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

19. Ivancevich, J. M. "Perceived Need Satisfactions of Domestic Versus Overseas Managers," Journal of Applied Psychology. Vo. 54, No. 4, 1969.

20. Johnson, P. V., and Marcrum, R. H. "Perceived Deficiencies in Individual Need Fulfillment of Career Army Officers", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 52, No. 6, 1968.

21. Litzinger, W. D. "Entrepreneurial Prototype in Bank Management", Academy of Management Journal, Vo. 6, No. 1, 1963.

22. Locke, E. A. (ed.) "Convergent and Discriminant Validity for Areas and Methods of Rating Job Satisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 48, 1964.

23. Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Motivation", Psychological Review, July 1943, Vol. 50, No. 4.

24. _____. "Deficiency Motivation and Growth Motivation", in M. R. Jones (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

25. _____. Eupsychian Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. and the Dorsey Press, 1965.

26. _____. Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Bros., Inc., 1954.

27. _____. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1968.

28. Meltzer, L., and Salter, J. "Organization Structure and the Performance and Job Satisfaction of Psychologists", American Sociological Review, Vo. 27, 1962.

29. Miller, E. L. "Job Satisfaction of National Union Officials", Personnel Psychology. Vo. 19, No. 3, 1966

30. Opinion Research Corporation. "Motivating Managers", ORC, Princeton, N. J. 1962.

31. Paine, F. T., Carroll, S. I., and Leete, B. A. "Need Satisfactions of Managerial Level Personnel in a Government Agency", Journal of Applied Pschology, Vo. 50, No. 3, 1966.

32. Porter, L. W. "A Study of Perceived Need Satisfactions in Botton and Middle Management kJobs", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 45, No. 1, February 1961.

33. _____. "Job Attitudes in Management: I. Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 46, 1962

34. _____. "Job Attitudes in Management: II. Perceived Importance of Needs as a Function of Job Level", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 47, 1963.

35. _____. "Organizational Patterns of Managerial Attitudes", American Foundation for Management Research, 1964.

36. _____. "Personnel Management", Annual Review of Psychology, Vo. 17, 1966.

37. _____. "Properties of Organization Structure in Relation to Job Attitudes and Job Behavior", Psychological Bulletin, Vo. 64, No. 1, 1965

38. _____ and Lawler, E. E. "The Effects of Tall versus Flat Organization Structure on Managerial Job Satisfaction", Personnel Psychology. Vol. 7 (2), Summer 1964.

39. _____ and Mitchell, V. F. "Comparative Study of Need Satisfactions in Military and Business Hierarchies," Journal of Applied Psychology. Vo. 51, No. 2, 1967

40. Rhinehart, J. B., Barett, R. P., DeWolfe, A. S., Griffin, J. E., and Spaner, F. E. "Comparative Study of Need Satisfactions to Governmental and Business Hierarchies", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 53, No. 3, June 1969.

41. Rogers, C. R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

42. _____. On Becoming a Person. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

43. Rosen, H. "Motivation in Management, A Study of Four Managerial Levels", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 44, 1960.

44. _____. "Managerial Role Interacting: A Study of Three Managerial Levels", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vo. 45, 1961.

45. _____. "Desirable Attributes of Work: Four Levels of Management Describe Their Job Environments", Journal of Applied Psychology. Vo. 45, 1961.

46. Smith, H. C. Psychology of Industrial Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1955.

49. Stogdill, R. M. "Personnel Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature", Journal of Psychology. Vo. 25, Nov. 25, 1948.

50. Trusty, F. M., and Sergiovanni, T. J. "Perceived Need Deficiencies of Teachers and Administrators: A Proposal for Restructuring Teacher Roles", Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn, 1966.